



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,406	10/17/2003	Keith A. Thuerk	BOC9-2003-0034 (403)	1299
40987	7590	06/27/2007		
AKERMAN SENTERFITT P. O. BOX 3188 WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33402-3188			EXAMINER ULRICH, NICHOLAS S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2173	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/27/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/688,406

Applicant(s)

THUERK, KEITH A.

Examiner

Nicholas S. Ulrich

Art Unit

2173

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-12 and 14-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 3 and 13 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/02/2004.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-26 are pending.
2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 7/02/2004 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 11, 12, 14, 16, 18, 21, 22, 23, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by North et al. (US 6505245).

In regard to **claim 1**, North discloses a method for presenting system services comprising the steps of:

establishing a plurality of system service profiles (*Column 5 lines 27-35*);

detecting a request for the presentation of system services (*Fig 7 and Column 15 lines 58-59: user logs into system for display of control profiles associated with particular user*);

determining one of said system service profiles associated with said request (*Column 5 lines 3-6: login defines the consoles the user has access to*)

and listing at least one system service in accordance with a system service profile (*Fig 9 and Column 15 lines 62-64: the screen of figure 9 displays all consoles the user has access to*).

In regard to **claim 2**, North discloses the step of ascertaining a user identity associated with said request, wherein said determination of said system service profile is based at least in part upon said ascertained user identity (*Column 5 lines 3-6*).

In regard to **claim 4**, North discloses the steps of:
categorizing said system services (*Column 5 lines 23-27*);
and displaying at least a portion of said system services within said graphical user interface according to said categories (*Fig 9 and Column 15 lines 62-64*).

In regard to **claim 6**, North discloses establishing step further comprising the step of: providing a system services configuration interface so that authorized users can modify at least one system service profile (*Column 10 line 66: North describes that*

profiles are constructed, it is inherent that some form of interface is used to construct profiles).

In regard to **claim 8**, North discloses wherein the system services are Microsoft (TM) system services that execute within a Microsoft (TM) type operating system (Column 6 lines 6-10).

In regard to **claims 11, 12, 14, 16, and 18**, machine readable storage claims 11, 12, 14, 16, and 18 correspond generally to method claims 1, 2, 4, 6, and 8, respectively, and recite similar features in computer readable storage form, and therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to **claim 21**, system claim 21 corresponds generally to method claim 1 and recites similar features in system form and therefore is rejected under the same rationale.

In regard to **claim 22**, North discloses a system for administrating operating system services comprising:

a services view configured to graphically display a plurality of operating system services (Fig 9 and Column 15 lines 62-64: *the screen of figure 9 displays all consoles the user has access to*).

means for limiting said services displayed within said services view to a subset of currently executing services based on at least one of a user identity and a server identity (*Column 5 lines 3-6: login defines the consoles the user has access to*).

and a profile management interface configured to permit an authorized user to customize said limiting means (*Column 10 line 66: North describes that profiles are constructed, it is inherent that some form of interface is used to construct profiles to customize which services are displayed to a user*).

In regard to **claim 23**, North discloses wherein said limiting means is a software plug-in for a Microsoft Windows (TM) type operating system (*Column 6 lines 6-10*).

In regard to **claim 26**, North discloses further comprising: means for ordering the display of said services according to a plurality of categories for said services (*Column 5 lines 22-26*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 5 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over North et al. (US 6505245) in view of Ramanathan et al. (US 6286047 B1).

In regard to **claims 5 and 15**, While North discloses categorizing system services, North fails to disclose categorizing system services according to servers that provide the system services.

However, Ramanathan discloses categorizing services based on servers that provide the services (*Column 10 lines 52-64*). At the time of invention it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to incorporate the teachings of Ramanathan to North invention in order to categorize services based on servers that provide the services. The motivation would be discover services and service elements of a network as taught by Ramanathan (*Column 3 lines 38-39*).

5. Claims 7, 10, 17, 20, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over North et al. (US 6505245) in view of Microsoft Computer Dictionary.

In regard to **claims 7 and 17**, while North teaches configuring service profiles (*Column 10 line 66: North describes that profiles are constructed*), North fails to show providing a series of views that represent a profile configuration wizard.

The Microsoft computer dictionary defines a wizard as an interactive help utility that guides the user through each step of a particular task (*Microsoft Computer Dictionary pg 573*). Wizards have been well known in the art for some time, therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use a wizard when constructing profiles in North's invention. The motivation is just that as described in the definition of a wizard, to help guide the user through a task.

In regard to **claims 10, 20, 24, and 25**, while North teaches providing service profiles and listing the services associated with those profiles, North fails to disclose integrating the service profiles with a directory service of an operating system including a Microsoft Active Directory.

However, the Microsoft Computer Dictionary teaches an active directory that is designed to enable applications to find, use, and manage directory resources including user names and permissions (*Microsoft Computer Dictionary pg 16*). It would have been obvious at the time of invention to those skilled in the art, to incorporate the teachings of Microsoft Computer Dictionary and integrate service profiles within an

active directory. The motivation would be to simplify directory-related activities associated with locating and administering network users and resources as taught by Microsoft Computer Dictionary (*pg 16*).

6. Claims 9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over North et al. (US 6505245) with reference to Background section of present invention.

In regard to **claims 9 and 19**, North fails to disclose presenting system services within a graphical user interface included within the Microsoft Configuration Utility.

However, the background section of the present invention discloses the Microsoft Configuration Utility, which is used for managing system services. Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to present system services within the Microsoft Configuration Utility. The motivation would be to manage system services as disclosed by the background section of the present invention.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 3 and 13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas S. Ulrich whose telephone number is 571-270-1397. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH 9:00 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on 571-272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nicholas Ulrich
6/20/2007
2173


TADESSE HAILU
PRIMARY EXAMINER